

Serial No. 09/046,677

Docket No.: 614.1889

REMARKS**STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-20 are pending and stand rejected.

Therefore, claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-20 are now presented for consideration.

No new matter is presented by the claim amendments, accordingly, entry and approval of same are submitted to be proper and are respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action at page 3, item 2, claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,898,756) in view of Rosen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,864,607) and Amadasi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,569,634) and further in view of Bulfer (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,966). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

According to page 4 of the Office Action, the Abstract of Manning et al. describes a "transmission-inhibiting device ... which detects dual-tone multi-frequency dialling signals across tip and ring conductors of a telephone link and switches in an a.c. load that attenuates the dialing signals by at least 30 dB..." -- as to which the Action asserts: "This is exactly the purpose of the claimed invention that Manning et al. reads on." Applicants respectfully traverse the assertion.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the recitations of Independent claims 1, 10, and 16-20 teaches or suggests such attenuation of the dialing signals as described in Manning et al. Moreover, it is improper to read features into the claims, which features are not recited in the claims. However, it appears that the Office Action has done just that, so as to assert that the claimed features of the present invention are found in Manning et al.

According to the applicant's claimed invention, when the DTMF command signal sent from the telephone unit and indicating one of the plurality of telephone services is detected, the "signal transmission inhibition unit" serves to disconnect the telephone network from the

Serial No. 09/046,677

Docket No.: 614.1889

telephone unit, inhibit transmission of the DTMF command signal from the telephone unit to the telephone network, and allow transmission of the DTMF command signal directly to the data processing device. Therefore, the applicant's claimed invention ensures that the DTMF command signal, sent from the telephone unit and indicating one of the plurality of telephone services, is not transmitted from the telephone unit (the sending-side user) of the communication support system to any telephone unit (the receiving-side user) over the PSTN.

None of Rosen et al., Amadasi et al. and Bulfer discloses or suggests the above-described features of the applicant's claimed invention, and none cures the deficiencies of Manning et al. mentioned above.

Independent claim 1 specifically recites: "when the telephone network is open-circuited from either of the telephone unit or the data processing device, completely blocks transmission of the DTMF command signal from the telephone unit to the telephone network and allows transmission of the DTMF command signal directly to the data processing device when the DTMF command signal indicates one of the plurality of telephone services." A person of ordinary skill in the art would not interpret an open-circuit as a circuit to attenuate the dialing signals. (Emphasis added.) This is clearly not the purpose of the claimed invention of the present invention.

The Office Action correctly recognized that Manning et al. fails to teach or suggest the recitations associated with the circumstance of when the telephone network is open-circuited, from either of the telephone unit or the data processing device. Accordingly, the Office Action relies on Amadasi et al. as describing such recitations.

Amadasi et al. provides a circuit to prevent the use of a telephone apparatus, intended for internal calls or normal calls, for long distance calls without the apparatus subscriber's consent by counting pulses corresponding to a first numeral selected on the dial and a series switch connected to the telephone line and controlled by the counter to disconnect the unauthorized call. See column 1, lines 5-42. However, by merely providing a switch to disconnect unauthorized long-distance calls, Amadasi et al. does not teach or suggest, "when the telephone network is **open-circuited from either of the telephone unit or the data processing device, completely blocks transmission of the DTMF command signal from the telephone unit to the telephone network and allows transmission of the DTMF command signal directly to the data processing device when the DTMF command signal indicates one of**

Serial No. 09/046,677

Docket No.: 614.1889

the plurality of telephone services," (emphasis added), as recited in independent claim 1.

The switch in Amadasi et al. does not refer to a DTMF command signal and does not teach or suggest allowing transmission of the DTMF command signal. This would not be feasible, since the purpose of the Amadasi et al. reference is to completely block transmission of any signal when the call is a long-distance call.

The Office Action improperly contends, when referring to Amadasi et al., that "the purpose and effect of attenuating a signal to the point that it cannot be recognized or picked up by the network is the same as open circuiting the telephone or data processing device." "Attenuation", by definition, is a general term that refers to any reduction in the strength of a signal. In contrast, "open circuit", by definition, is a term that refers to an incomplete electrical circuit in which no current flows. Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not interpret an "open circuit" to be the same as the effect of "attenuation". It is improper to interpret both terms to have the same meaning.

Thus, Manning et al. is directed to detecting dual-tone multi-frequency dialing signals across tip and ring conductors of a telephone link, connecting a capacitor C1 and resistor R1 to provide a low impedance path between tip and ring, and switching in an A.C. load that attenuates the dialing signals by at least 30 dB. Amadasi et al. in turn is directed to preventing unauthorized long-distance calls by disconnecting the line with the telephone exchange. Combining both references would not provide for all the recitations of the signal transmission inhibition unit recited in independent claim 1.

According to MPEP 2143.01, the modification proposed in the Office Action cannot render the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Assuming, arguendo, that the teachings of Manning et al. and Amadasi et al. could be combined, the combination would provide a transmission-inhibiting device attenuating signals sent between telephones by disconnecting the telephone lines. It is not possible to attenuate the signals sent between telephones when the lines transmitting those signals are disconnected. Accordingly, the combination of the cited references proposed in the Action, contrary to the requirements of MPEP 2143.01, would render each unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

Serial No. 09/046,677

Docket No.: 614.1889

Referring to Rosen et al., this reference generally describes a system to effectively isolate a telephone from an external phone line 128, allowing the telephone to communicate with a CIU 102 by RF carrier signals sent over line 130. When the non-PIU telephone 114 is picked up, the CIU 102 turns off its carrier signal to force all telephones to revert to ordinary telephone operation." See, column 4, line 58 to column 5, line 6.

However, similarly to Manning et al. and Amadasi et al., Rosen et al. is silent as to any teaching or even suggestion of "a signal transmission inhibition unit including a switch connected between the telephone network and either the telephone unit or the data processing device to switch therebetween so as to selectively open-circuit the telephone network from either of the telephone unit or the data processing device, and when the telephone network is open-circuited from either of the telephone unit or the data processing device, completely blocks transmission of the DTMF command signal from the telephone unit to the telephone network and allows transmission of the DTMF command signal directly to the data processing device when the DTMF command signal indicates one of the plurality of telephone services," as recited in independent claim 1. Rather, Rosen et al. uses RF carrier signals sent over the network line 130. See, FIG. 1. Thus, the Rosen et al. telephone network is not switched between the telephone unit or the data processing device. The Rosen et al. system merely uses the existing telephone network line 130 and prevents the telephone from seizing the telephone network line 130.

Bulfer, which is directed to "telecommunications network service for converting spoken words to individual DTMF signals," does not suggest anything related to the above-mentioned distinguishing features recited in claim 1. See Bulfer at column 2, lines 25-27

Further, assuming, arguendo, that the description of Manning et al., Amadasi et al., Rosen et al., and Bulfer were combined, the combination would provide a transmission-inhibiting device to attenuate signals sent between telephones by disconnecting the telephone lines, to receive a voice command transmitted from the telephone when the telephone is off-hook, and to isolate the telephone from an external phone line when receiving the voice command from the telephone line. It is not possible to attenuate the signals sent between telephones or to receive a voice command when the lines transmitting those signals are disconnected. Accordingly, contrary to the requirements of MPEP 2143.01, the combination of the cited references would render them unsatisfactory for their intended purpose.

Serial No. 09/046,677

Docket No.: 614.1889

It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the application and the rejected claims in view of the above arguments and withdraw the rejections.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited. At a minimum, this Amendment should be entered at least for purposes of Appeal, since it either clarifies and/or narrows the issues for consideration by the Board.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner's contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Dec. 20, 2004By: [Signature]
H.J. Staas
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 12-20-2004
STAAS & HALSEY
By: [Signature]
Date: 12-20-04